DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 626 EA 011 511

AUTHOR Miles, Matthew B.; And Others
TITLE OD in Schools: The State of the Art. Vol. V: Implications for Policy, Research and Practice. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Center for Policy Research, New York, N.Y.; Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 78
CONTRACT 400-77-0051; 400-77-0052
NOTE 29p.; For related documents, see EA 011 348 and EA 011 508-510; Preface may not reproduce clearly due to light print

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Intermediate Administrative Units; *Organizational Development; School Districts; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS Canada; United States

ABSTRACT

This is the last in a five-volume series concerned with organization development (OD) in the schools. First, along with discussing limitations of the sampling, it briefly summarizes conclusions from the review of the literature (volume 2), the study of consultants and the study of districts (volume 3), and the three case studies (volume 4). Second, it comments briefly on a working definition of OD in schools and sketches some of the issues that might be involved in its future as far as American and Canadian schools are concerned. Third, it offers advice on policy and practice to local school districts, intermediate units, universities, state departments of education, and federal agencies concerned with education. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169626

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OD IN SCHOOLS: THE STATE OF THE ART

VOL. V: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY, RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Matthew B. Miles
Center for Policy Research
New York, N.Y.

Michael Fullan
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Gib Taylor
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada

August, 1978

EA 011 511

Final report to National Institute of Education, Contract Nos. 400-77-0051, 0052. Ideas and conclusions contained in this report should not be viewed as representing the official policy of the National Institute of Education

PREFACE

This study of the state of the art of Organization Development (OD) in education consists of a comprehensive assessment of the state of knowledge of OD in education and the nature and extent of use of OD in school districts in the United States and Canada. The study is divided into five separate volumes, all under the general title, OD in Schools: the State of the Art.

Volume I, Introduction, includes an introduction and overview of the project, and an executive summary of the main findings and conclusions of the different components of the study.

Volume II, Review of Reviews, assesses the state of knowledge of OD in the research literature by reviewing over fifty recent sources. This review concentrates on theoretically and empirically based overviews, comparative studies, commentaries and critiques of OD in general, and OD in education in particular. The review focusses on a review of reviews, but also includes recent major case studies of OD in education. The literature review involves four major themes or aspects of OD: 1) assumptions, values, goals and definitions of OD, 2) operating characteristics (conditions affecting entry, initiation and continuance of OD programs), 3) effects or impact, and 4) the future of OD.

Volume III, OD Consultants/OD Programs in School Districts, consists of two empirical studies of OD in school systems which we carried out. The first study involved identifying and gathering questionnaire data on over 300 OD consultants in education in the United States and Canada. Information was collected on the location, position, background, training, OD approaches and extent of activities of the consultants in working with school districts. Nominations were obtained from the consultants of school districts which they thought were involved in "sustained" (lasting a minimum of 18 months) OD programs. These nominations were used to construct a sample of school districts with sustained OD programs. Detailed information by questionnaire and telephone was collected from a final sample of 76 districts. Data were gathered and analyzed on the size of districts, type of OD program, problems addressed, approaches taken, how the program got started and on a whole host of factors involved in the initiation and operation of the program. Direct information was also obtained on the outcomes of the programs - impact on the organization and on students, attitudes toward OD and its diffusion, and the degree of institutionalization of the program in the district. Multiple regression analyses were carried out to determine the influence of district characteristics, and various operating factors on the outcomes of the OD effort. Several clear and important new findings about the nature, use and effects of OD were uncovered, and are discussed in the report. To the best of our knowledge this study represents the first large scale quantitative analysis of OD programs in school districts.

Volume IV, Case Studies, contains three on-site case studies conducted by us. The three cases were selected from the sample of 76. The purpose of the case studies was to analyze in more detail different types of OD programs and their use. We interviewed a cross section of people in each district and analyzed available documentation. Each case study was selected to represent a different type of OD focus - Case Study A involved a Survey Feedback and Professional Development approach, Case Study B combined an MBO/OD focus, and Case Study C was primarily Curriculum based. The case study themes provided more illuminating and explanatory detail regarding the findings in the district analysis, as well as suggested some new ideas about the use of OD in school districts.

Volume V, Implications for Policy, Research and Practice, summarizes the main results of the project as a whole, sets out a revised working definition of OD in schools, and formulates a series of policy and research recommendations for different organiztions: local school districts, intermediate units, universities, state, provincial and federal government agencies concerned with education. Recommendations for how and if OD should be used and about the future of OD in schools are also discussed in Volume V.

A great deal of cooperation and help made this study possible. We would like to thank the OD consultants and school district personnel who provided so much time and information in giving us a rich array of information on their activities and programs. Leaders and other school personnel in the three case study sites - Winnipeg in Canada, Adams County District No. 12, and Garden City in the United States - deserve a special thanks for spending so much time with us.

Richard Schmuck made valuable suggestions regarding the design of the study. Frederick Mulhauser of NIE was helpful and supportive throughout the study in formulating important policy questions to be addressed. Joan May of OISE worked beyond the call of duty in providing administrative help and coordination. We would like to thank her for her strong support in helping us complete the project.

A limited number of copies of the volumes are available at cost:

Vol. I.	- Introduction and Executive Summary	$ 1.50
Vol. II.	- Review of Reviews	$ 4.00
Vol. III.	- OD Consultants/OD Programs in School Districts	$ 4.50
Vol. IV.	- Case Studies	$10.50
Vol. V.	- Implications for Policy, Research and Practice	$ 2.50
	Total for all five volumes -	$23.00

Please send requests and payment to Michael Fullan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1V6.

CONTENTS

PREFACE i

INTRODUCTION 1

I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 1

The review of reviews and case studies 1
The study of consultants 5
The study of districts 5
The case studies 7
Sampling limitations 8

II. OD AND ITS FUTURE IN SCHOOLS 9

III. ADVICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES 10

Local school districts 10
Intermediate units 14
State and Provincial departments of education 15
Federal education agencies (esp. NIE) 18

REFERENCES 24

Introduction

As a Federal project officer once remarked, "Any turkey can collect data..." To draw wise and useful implications from even a well-collected and well-analyzed set of data, as we believe ours to be, is obviously not a straightforward task. Even if one's assumptions and predilections can be cleanly distinguished from the actual findings, and if the findings can be clearly linked to possible decisions and actions, the fact remains that advice is being given to a range of different consumers, themselves embedded in particular organizational contexts. And whatever else is uncertain about planned change, one thing is clear: the distance between advice and implementation of it is a long and rocky path, on which the "implications" part of a report like this one is only a first step.

This part of the study has several sections. First, we very briefly summarize our conclusions from the review of the literature (Vol. II), the study of consultants and the study of districts (Vol. III), and the three case studies (Vol. IV).[1] We also discuss the limitations of our sampling.

Second, we comment briefly on a working definition of OD in schools, and sketch some of the issues that might be involved in its future as far as American and Canadian schools are concerned.

Third, we outline our advice to a series of different organizations: local school districts, intermediate units, universities, state departments of education, and federal agencies concerned with education, including NIE and the Office of Education. We will not necessarily make a formal separation into implications for practice, research, and policy for each user organization, but try to speak as practically as possible to the sorts of decisions each might ordinarily and plausibly be making about OD in schools.

I Summary of Findings

The review of reviews and case studies (Vol. II)

We reviewed approximately 70 sources in the literature including some 25 critiques or commentaries on OD, a similar number of overviews, empirical and/or theoretical reviews of the field, and about 15 case studies of OD efforts in school districts. We identified the major issues, problems and state of research knowledge according to four main categories - 1) values, themes and goals of OD, 2) operating characteristics (entry and operational factors in using OD, 3) outcomes, and, 4) the future of OD.

On the issue of values and goals we found that the key components which characterized OD consisted of efforts which involved planned change, long range attempts at improving the quality of life of individuals, improving group and organizational processes and organizational performance,

---

[1] The reader who wants a fuller review should return to the conclusions sections of each volume.

or productivity usually with the asssistance of internal and external change agents, and involving the use of behavioral science concepts and techniques in a reflexive, self-analytic way. We also found two major types of problems at the outset. First, many activities which are labelled OD (e.g. one-shot workshops, training of individuals and small groups, etc) did not meet the definition of what OD is supposed to be. Simply put, many activities which are called OD are not really OD at all. This has contributed to a confusion about what OD is, and to a reputation that OD is superficial or irrelevant. The second type of problem concerned the possible discrepancy between the intentions or espoused values of OD, and the 'values in practice'. Certain critiques of the assumptions and actual use of OD stressed that OD programs may not in fact address the human side of development and the quality of life of organizational members with equal integrity as they address the organizational side. OD practitioners, despite their intentions, may not be operating in a value congruent way with the possible result that a) certain goals are not achieved or b) impact is superficial, or c) OD is experienced as inconsequential or supporting the status quo instead of accomplishing its espoused goals. We also found that many of the definitions of OD were general and tended to mask the complexities, specific components and dilemmas involved in its use.

We then turned to the operating characteristics of OD in school districts and in general, in other types of organizations. Regarding the latter, we analyzed several comparative empirical reviews of OD, and for the former, we analyzed a number of recent case studies of OD in school districts.

To sum up our findings about the use of OD programs in school districts: entry is critical, it depends on strong specific support from top management; either a certain level of organizational readiness must exist, or the OD program must be designed/presented in a way which convinces school people that it is task relevant, practical in the short run, and will not be unduly costly in time or money. On the other, some authors provide strong and convincing evidence that a minimum time expenditure (upwards of four person days per staff) is important to warn people about. There must be some willingness to invest a certain amount of time and energy. Moreover, OD does cost some money, and programs which are totally dependent on outside money will likely not receive the commitment from the beginning. Some financial investment of the district and the schools (and here we are not talking about large sums) would seem to be an accurate indicator of potential success of the program. Decision-making about whether to become involved in an OD program is somewhat complicated. It appears that different routes are possible depending on the conditions. Ideally early participation by all administrators and staff is best. There is some evidence, however, that administrators and teachers could be involved in some pre-start OD activities as a precondition to decisions to participate which would be made at a later time during the early transition phase. Also, political skills and orientation to working with the power relations in the setting are explicitly advocated by some authors.

During the transition or initial use, active involvement, support and understanding of the program by top management, and by principals are essential. When this was present, the programs seem to get off to a good

start. When it was absent, the program experienced problems or went nowhere. Sustained training and work over the period of two years also seems to be necessary for implementing OD programs during the transition phase. The establishment and use of internal OD consultants and administrative coordination (preferably with liaison or involvement responsibilities at the school level as well as at the level of coordinating the district effort) combined with proactive use of external consultants is also important - the multiplier approach of using external consultants to train insiders who would in turn train others was also noted. Programs which do not build this internal capacity, and/or which build up a dependency on one or more external consultants are probably heading for trouble.

The review of comparative reviews of OD in organizations showed that the state of theory and research in OD needs considerable more work; in particular, none of the reviews allowed us to test in a rigorous specific way the relationship between goals and operating factors. There are some quite promising beginnings which have appeared in rapid succession in the past two or three years; these beginnings tend to provide support that OD is most effective when it includes support and specific involvement of top and lower level administrators, use of internal change agents using external resources in a proactive way, survey feedback and/or other organizationally focussed efforts rather than lab training or small group work, focus on specific problems rather than general ones, and participative and collaborative modes of intervention; many formally classified OD efforts may not meet the criteria of "authentic OD" vis-a-vis our definitional analysis (i.e., many focus on short-term lab or individual focussed training); a minority of OD efforts take place for more than two years (a time considered by many to be the minimum necessary for effectiveness and institutionalization); there seems to be a slight trend toward more sophisticated and authentic use of OD (that is, a closer congruence between the components of OD and their presence as operating characteristics); lastly, the contribution of the findings in the reviews (based mainly in industrial organizations) to our knowledge of OD in schools is generally supportive or reinforcing, but not specifically helpful - few of the cases involved schools, and the detailed variables and their operation in the school based case studies which we reviewed earlier are not tested at a specific level, because the variables used in the reviews were more crudely measured than would be necessary for such a test.

We explicitly examined the outcomes of OD efforts. Our findings: first, the probability that any given OD program, in or out of schools, will be "successful" is perhaps .5 or less. Failures are as likely as successes. But this conclusion must be qualified in several ways. First, not a few OD programs that have been studied appear to have been ineptly conducted; they focussed on individual training rather than on OD, they dealt with superficial issues, they lacked a coherent model, or they did not match interventions to diagnosed problems. Excluding these studies would improve success rates, of course, but the fact is that any domain of professional practice must in part be judged by how well the average or typical practitioner does.

Second, many studies of OD have had methodological weaknesses, including measurement errors and artifacts, over-reliance on questionnaires, lack of adequate controls, and failure to follow the program for a sustained period. Here it is less clear what the effects on success rates are: it is entirely possible that requiring more research stringency would reduce the proportions of OD programs found to be successful. So we must be cautious about making large claims for OD, in or out of schools.

We should also note that even where success was claimed (or even reasonably well validated), it appears difficult to make precise explanatory statements of obtained results. This is in part because OD's underlying theory is not particularly crisp, in part because of the inherent complexity of studying organizational intervention, and in part because clear process measures, capable of being linked to outcome, were often absent.

Knowledge about OD cumulates slowly. Any given project takes at least two to three years; the N of any given project is for practical purposes one; the complexity of organizations and the object of study and the diverse state of present organization theory retards the development of good OD theory. It seems likely that OD practice in some respects is more sophisticated and competent than what has been written about it. But this is speculation, not well supported.

The assessment of OD's impact in schools as such suffers from all the problems outlined above. Schools also have an extra problem: their "bottom line"outcomes are supposedly those of improved cognitive, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes in students. But (a) these goals are often diffuse, general and measurable with difficulty; (b) students are often not directly involved in OD programs as participants, but are expected to benefit somehow in a "trickle-down" fashion from human-system or educational programmatic changes introduced among and by the adults of the system. Student benefits certainly need not be the only justification for OD's value in schools - adults in schools have a legitimate claim for a better quality of their working lives - but they cannot be ignored as a criterion of OD's success in schools. So far, impact of this sort has been less frequently reported than impact on adults. And, as with OD in other settings, the explanation of outcomes is weak. We might speculate that coordination of problems and "loose coupling" in schools make it even more difficult to link programs to outcomes. Nonetheless, it is possible to gather more direct evaluation information on the operation of OD programs in schools and on reported outcomes, especially if multiple methods of data gathering are used.

Until this kind of information is more available, the question of the future of OD in schools will remain largely unanswerable. We concluded the review by suggesting that the values and conceptual bases which underly OD are far more important than its technology; the future of OD is contending with mislabelling (one-shot training workshops which are called OD, but do not meet the requirements of the definition) and misuse (applying the technology without its value and conceptual base as fundamental guiding features); there is some hint that the diffusion of more solid OD programs in school districts is occurring on a small scale, but there are probably as many or more misuses and failures as there are successes. Moreover, the data base is weak; much more information is needed on the use of OD in school districts before we can comment on the future of OD in schools. The consultant and school district components of the project were designed to reduce this gap.

The study of consultants. In brief we located 308 consultants who have been doing OD with schools in the United States and Canada. This number is approximately double those located in 1971 by Schmuck and Miles (1971). The consultants are not concentrated in any particular region of either country. About a third are based directly in school districts, and a quarter in universities. Only about half of the sample has received formal training in OD practice, either under university or NTL auspices. Much is learned informally, on the job. Most of the consultants had worked with only one or two districts. The majority of OD programs they mentioned working on began in 1974 or later; there has been a modest increase in numbers of programs started each year since the late 60's. Altogether, these consultants mentioned 340 different districts in which they had carried out some OD work, and about half of these had operated for a year or more. The median amount of time spent with a district is about 15-20 days annually. The work of these consultants tended to involve task-oriented organizational issues most frequently, then personnel development and socio-emotional issues. Approaches are most typically training, process consultation, problem solving, planning and data feedback; structural approaches, and use of OD task forces and confrontation meetings were less frequent. Direct work with student issues was quite rare.

The study of districts. Through nominations from the consultants, other districts, and state department officials, we located a sample of 76 school districts (56 in the U.S., and 20 in Canada) where OD work had gone on for at least 18 months. The definition used was: "a sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, focussing on change in organizational procedures, processes, norms or structures, using behavioral science concepts". In-service training of separate individuals not aimed directly at system or sub-unit improvement was excluded. Districts in our sample were above-average in size, wealth, and proportion of working-class constituencies. Urban and suburban districts were about equally represented, with towns and villages less frequent. The most frequent reasons for launching OD were task-oriented organizational issues, educational issues as such, and problems of educational output. Crucial "start" conditions were typically support from a new (or the existing) superintendent, secondarily the existence of problems and the availability of grant funds.

The general approaches used varied a good deal: about a third were "classical OD" with strong attention to improving the organization as a human system; another fifth emphasized skills development in personnel. The remainder ranged from MBO/PPBS and comprehensive school improvement approaches to those focussing on curriculum improvement, accountability, and desegregation; a few were quite indeterminate or diffuse in approach. The median length of effort was three years; the bulk of the sample said work was continuing, and would become institutionalized. As with the consultants, the most frequent change technologies used were training, data feedback, problem-solving, planning and process consultation, with less attention to confrontation meetings, OD task forces, and techno-structural activity.

OD programs used outside consultants (median number, 3, with the most salient one spending about 15 days), and many more inside consultants (median number, 12, with the most salient one spending 200 days). The insiders were primarily line managers, with little or no formal or informal training in the conduct of OD programs, and little or no linkage to other OD professionals.

As the programs proceeded, task-oriented and output-oriented concerns remained high, while socio-emotional issues received less attention. Even so, socio-emotional outcomes - both expected and unexpected - were frequently reported as having been achieved.

About half the districts had district level coordinators, an OD steering group, and released time available to support the effort. Specially trained cadres and building-level coordinators were rarer. Training manuals proved the most crucial sort of materials. The operating dollar costs involved varied widely, but the median amount spent annually was only $5 - 10,000, a very modest amount. The time costs were more substantial - about 10 days per year for at least a quarter of the total staff. Only about half the programs had a formal evaluation attached to them, but few of these were systematic or thoroughgoing. However, our questionnaire developed measures of three basic program outcomes: impact, attitudes, and institutionalization; they were only moderately correlated with each other.

The impact of programs was most frequently reported to lie in the task and socio-emotional aspects of organizational functioning. Student effects, often unspecified and mainly "soft" changes rather than "hard" test data, were mentioned by 70% of districts. Altogether, only a third of districts mentioned specific "soft effects" and another 9%, achievement gains. Most districts reported some negative effects, such as resistance, threat, or increased work load, but these seemed to be non-fatal, more or less routine aspects of the work. Finally, it was very clear that the OD programs were associated with an increased rate of educational change, (implementation of instructional innovations) in the district.

The programs also seemed to generate positive attitudes toward OD: only half said they would have done anything differently. Two thirds of the districts thought that OD should "definitely" be used more widely in their country's schools, and the majority had explained their program to others at workshops and conferences, and through informal contact. About a third of the districts had visited other districts to explain their work, had sent out reports, or had written articles. So program users tended to proselytize.

How well institutionalized were the programs? Three quarters of the districts predicted continuation in more or less "built-in" form.

Analysis showed that both impact and positive (dissemination-prone) attitude were necessary conditions for institutionalization: impact without positive attitude, or attitude without evidence of impact tended to make institutionalization unlikely.

Regression analyses examining the correlates of these three types of outcomes showed that impact was most likely to be high in programs of larger scale (dollars, time), with good technical support (inside and outside consultants, training materials) and sustained task orientation (including a structural emphasis). Positive attitudes towards dissemination of OD programs were most likely in larger-scale programs, with task and structural emphasis, plus attention to educational content issues as such. The presence of internal coordinators was another positive indicator. Firmer institutionalization was also present in programs with strong educational and structural emphases, supported by training materials and manuals. But the scale of well-institutionalized programs turned out to be moderate, rather than large, with less reliance on external consultants. Large scale programs were less likely to become institutionalized.

The general approach to OD also made a difference in outcome. "Classical" OD, plus two other system-oriented, comprehensive approaches (comprehensive school improvement and MBO/PPBS-related) were most likely to show clear impact, positive attitudes and institutionalization. "Indeterminate" approaches without a clear rationale, "personnel development" (skill training for individuals), and state-mandated "accountability" approaches all were inferior on the three outcomes (except that personnel development programs tended to be institutionalized at an average rate). Canadian OD programs, on the average, were less effective on all three outcomes than those in the United States, largely because they were "indeterminate" or "personnel-development"-oriented, rather than system oriented, and had fewer well-trained internal or external consultants available.

We draw several conclusions from the school district study. It appears that there is a great deal of "hidden" or less visible OD work in school districts which neither contributes to the practice and theory of OD beyond the district, nor benefits from association with others doing similar work. Second, there is variation in approaches to OD, which in turn is related to subsequent effectiveness. There is more than one route to success, but some routes are less effective than others - notably those with unsystematic theory or with a sole focus on individual training. Finally, in general, school districts interested in OD would be well advised to address the entry and operating factors identified in our analyses of school district experience.

The case studies. Three case studies were carried out: one was a combined survey feedback and professional-development approach in a large urban Canadian district, the second was an MBO-linked approach in a moderate-sized suburban U.S. district, and the third was a curriculum-based approach in a small U.S. district. Many themes from the district study were reconfirmed in the cases, particularly the roles of top-management support needed for program initiation, the need for structural and educational task emphasis, the importance of strong and sustained inside change agent presence, the low dollar cost and high time costs, and the existence of reasonably clear (but poorly evaluated) obtained benefits. These benefits were limited, however, in extent of staff coverage, and student impact. But some new themes appeared: (1) the importance of a clear, coherent

program vision, accompanied by careful front-end planning; (2) the possibility that OD programs are easier to launch when the external environment is not turbulent; (3) the importance of a close working partnership between a sophisticated inside change agent and the top manager of the district; (4) the idea that the OD program is not an "add-on" but a "way of life" in the district; (5) the importance of "multiplier" effects achieved by steady attention to the training of internal trainers; and (6) the likelihood that real institutionalization may take up to 5 years or more to achieve.

Sampling limitations. The consultant study findings are probably quite representative. The questionnaire was brief, and the incentives for replying plausible (we offered a list of other consultants, and a list of current OD-using districts, plus a report summary). The 45% return rate is conservative, since we knew that many non-replying sample members were not actually consultants but informants about OD-using districts.

The district study findings should be interpreted with more care. A number of respondents refused response on grounds of length; the incentives (same as for consultants) were probably weaker for district personnel. The data are self-reports of individual respondents — themselves usually key figures in the effort — providing information on behalf of the district. We do not know what the assessment of the programs by other administrators, or teachers, in those districts would be, although the three case studies are encouraging validations of the questionnaire data in this respect. We do not know how teachers or students would have responded.

Perhaps most crucially, our 76 districts, though they are a much larger sample than anyone would have predicted existed, are a success-biased sample. They had sustained OD work in their systems for at least 18 months, and liked what they had done enough, in most cases, to continue it. They also liked it enough that they felt free to describe the experience, and to take one to two hours to complete the questionnaire. Our sample does not include districts who had never heard of OD, or who knew about it but did not try it, or who knew about it, tried it and discontinued it short of 18 months. Finally, we should remind the reader that the sample over-represents larger and wealthier districts.

The three case studies are success studies drawn from an already success-biased sample. They validate the questionnaire responses, but they are exhibits of OD working well. As such, they are instructive — but they can obscure the fact the other programs in our sample of 76 were limping, and less effective.

II OD AND ITS FUTURE IN SCHOOLS

A revised definition. As we have seen, the question of what OD "is" is not simple and one subject to a good deal of debate in the general OD literature. Our present inclination is toward a revised definition of this sort:

> Organization development in school districts is a coherent, systematically-planned, sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, focussing explicitly on change in formal and informal procedures, processes, norms or structures, using behavioral science concepts. The goals of OD include both the quality of life of individuals as well as improving organizational functioning and performance.

The revisions should be noted. The requirement of coherence and systematic planning may be too normative, but does serve to distinguish OD from haphazard efforts casually labelled "OD", as increasingly seems to be the case in our experience. The emphasis on explicitness indicates that OD deals directly with organizational phenomena and their alteration, rather than inducing changes indirectly through some other vehicle. The inclusion of both formal and informal organizational issues makes for more thoroughness, and excludes simply-"official" rearrangements. The emphasis on quality of life of individuals and on organizational performance highlights the dual goal of OD and potential problems in pursuing these goals in a balanced value congruent way. The permissive inclusion of educational content acknowledges that such work is a primary task of school districts, but indicates that curriculum-focussed work is not necessarily OD in the absence of the preceding qualifiers. The label "sustained" is perhaps best left unspecified, though the 18-month figure is probably useful as a guide, given the year-by-year planning often characteristic of school districts.

The future of OD in schools. Although our data located many more OD-using districts than most knowledgeable people thought had existed, it seems quite unlikely that more than 1% of U.S. and Canadian districts are engaged in OD. The increase in the diffusion rate is at present very gradual. We are dealing with a relatively complex, poorly "packaged", poorly understood, and labor-intensive innovation, — and, an innovation which, once adopted, is likely to cause substantial changes in the adopting organization. That these changes are generally positive does not obscure the fact that the "bureaucratic costs" of the innovation (Pincus, 1974) are high. The incentives for adoption are not universally present in school districts. OD appears to be a good way to increase instructional innovation, to increase participation by all levels of personnel, and to improve various aspects of task and socio-emotional functioning, if it is done right, i.e., if the program meets the requirements in the definition of OD, and if it is implemented in a way which includes the key operating characteristics identified in our review of the literature, and in our school district sample. But not all districts (or their communities) want to innovate; not all superintendents and principals wish for more upward influence on teachers' parts; and not all districts feel a clear need for better functioning, even though external observers might claim that any social system has its

poorly functioning aspects. In any case, the future of OD in school districts is clouded by the scarcity of well articulated programs and practice which are consistent with its underlying principles and goals. This may also be true of OD's use in other types of organizations, but it is especially problematic in schools due to the recency of its emergence and to the adverse environmental conditions which are now demanding more of OD and other educational innovations than was the case in the 1960's.

So the prospects for OD in the future of schooling in these two countries are not clear. On balance, we believe that encouraging the further diffusion of OD is worthwhile, and that some deliberate, stimulative efforts can be mounted for a relatively small cost; these are discussed below. Without such efforts, OD in schools will probably continue to diffuse slowly, and/or to suffer the fate of vulgarization that has occurred with most other complex and substantial educational innovations, from "progressive education" onward.

III. ADVICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES

Local school districts. What useful suggestions for policy and practice can be made to superintendents, boards of education, and other local decision-makers?

1. Who can benefit? The school district considering the use of OD need not be put off by its own demographics. Though OD tends to be adopted by somewhat larger and somewhat wealthier districts, size and wealth do not correlate with success. And OD was successfully used in urban, suburban, town and village settings.[2]

2. Indications for use. A close examination of the "start" problems mentioned by districts, when compared with indicators of successful outcome, indicates that useful impact is more likely when the presenting problems are defined in terms of educational issues as such,[3] task-oriented

---

[2]There are some differences: fewer metropolitan settings (over 300,000) and urban settings reported high impact (45% and 44%, when the average for all districts was 52%; 60% of suburban districts had high impact). Fewer urban districts also reported high positive dissemination-prone attitudes toward OD (46% as vs. 56% for the whole sample; 60% of town and village settings reported high attitudes). Again suburban districts were more positive (63%).

However, urban districts were more likely to report strong institutionalization; (84% as vs. 78% for the whole sample); only 64% of metropolitan districts were high institutionalizers.

So metropolitan districts are weaker on impact and institutionalization; urban districts are weaker on impact and attitude; suburban districts are stronger on impact and attitude; and town/village districts are weak on attitude.

[3]"Educational issues" on our coding scheme included educational philosophy, curriculum, program implementation, teaching methods, classroom climate, discipline and similar items. Illustratively: 74% of districts beginning with such problems achieved high OD impact, while the average for all districts was 51%. Only 44% of those not mentioning educational issues had high impact.

organizational concerns,[4] and structural change.[5] Initial concern with socio-emotional issues, such as communication, trust, climate, etc., makes for average impact.

Positive attitudes toward OD and its dissemination to other districts are most likely when the presenting problems are those of educational issues, organizational task issues, and structure; external education issues;[6] focus on subsystems such as teams, departments or meetings are also associated with more positive attitude outcomes.

Finally, institutionalization of the OD program is most likely when the early problems are defined as involving organization output,[7] and task-oriented organizational issues.

Some data suggest that use of OD may be contra-indicated in situations of environmental pressure or turbulence. For example only 40% of districts beginning with external problems (see footnote 6) achieved high impact, when the average was 51%. Our three case studies, all successes, had stable relations with their environments.

3. Needed "start conditions". OD programs are most likely to have high impact when they are instituted by a new superintendent (62% probability of high impact, as compared to 51% average); as Carlson (1965) has pointed out, new superintendents, especially when they come from outside, have a license to innovate. Support from the existing superintendent is also important.

Positive attitudes toward OD are more likely where there is support from the top (67% as versus an average of 55% for all districts), and, where a grant for OD has been received, 68% (implying that there was active planning for OD in the first place).

---

[4] Task-oriented organizational concerns included goals and goal-setting, planning, problem-solving, decision-making, role clarification, etc. 68% of those with such early concerns had high impact; 33% of those without such concerns had high impact.

[5] Structural issues included reorganization, decentralization, consolidation, new starts, elementary-secondary articulation, etc. 57% of those with such starting problems experienced high impact; 50% without them had high impact.

[6] External educational issues included school-community relations, state requirements, negotiations, accountability, desegregation, and financing. 70% of those with such concerns had high attitude outcomes; 53% of those without did so. The average for all districts was 55%.

[7] Organizational output issues included responsiveness to change, quality of work life, effectiveness, and productivity; 88% of districts with such concerns achieved high institutionalization, and 75% of those without them did so. The average for all districts was 78%.

Institutionalization of the OD program is more likely where a grant was received (87% vs. 78% for all districts, but very large grants were negatively associated with subsequent institutionalization); and where the support and willingness of many people (below the top) is assured. (We are speaking here only of the start-condition aspects predictive of later institutionalization: as we have seen, it takes much more than this to assure that an OD program gets built in.)

4. Cost-benefit ratio. OD programs can be expected to improve organizational climate and functioning, to increase the rate of instructional innovation, and (probability about .4) improve student learning outcomes. Their dollar cost is relatively small, perhaps ½ of 1% of total budget, and is comparable to amounts usually spent on in-service education. The time costs are more substantial, perhaps a minimum of 10 days annually per person involved. These costs can be expected to continue for a minimum of 3 years for useful effects to be experienced; 5 years is more likely for thorough institutionalization to take place. By that point such costs would become a routinized aspect of life in the system.

5. Approach to choose. Users are advised to pick OD approaches which are comprehensive, systematic, and oriented to structural change, such as "classical OD"[8], comprehensive school improvement approaches (such as IGE, National Academy of School Executives, and CFK) and MBO/PPBS approaches which include careful attention to the "human" aspect of the organization. Training or skill-development approaches will work well if they are part and parcel of a system-oriented approach; otherwise they should be avoided.

6. Planning. A substantial effort should go into "meta-planning" before the program is launched, so that the scope, general approach, and reasons for beginning OD are very clear. (This planning might follow a brief introductory diagnostic/change effort with the top administrative group, to insure top support and clarity based on direct experience.)

Programs which are planned from the start to have impact on curriculum and instruction, and to influence student outcomes, are much more likely to do so.

7. Supports needed. Top administrators need (a) to support the OD program "emotionally" (i.e., with commitment) and rationally (clarity of vision); (b) to behave in ways that are congruent with the program's working assumptions; (c) to provide as much stability as possible in funding, role definitions, etc. to insure a good "platform" for the program.

It is important for the superintendent to have a strong and close working relationship with whomever is the central inside consultant or change agent. (see below). A clear conception of the purpose and direction of the OD program should characterize the orientation of these two key insiders.

---

[8]"Classical OD" ordinarily applies much attention to issues such as system-level communication, problem-solving, norms, group functioning, and the human side of the organization. See Schmuck and Miles (1971), and Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends (1977) for illustrative activities, instruments and research results.

It is advisable to have a district-wide coordinator for the OD program. This may be integrated with or operate in a line relationship to staff. A small steering group is desirable for general strategy planning and tactical decision-making.

8. Outside consultants. Program initiation and early stages will go more effectively if capable outsiders are part of the enterprise. They should be used to aid with strategy planning, to carry out initial interventions, to train inside consultants and trainers (the "multiplier" strategy), and to aid with the development of new program components or packages. Extensive use of outsiders heightens impact, but reduces institutionalization. Perhaps not more than 20 days a year per consultant is optimal.

9. Inside consultants. In a district of 1,000 staff or more, it is probably useful to have a full-time OD specialist. Put another way, a system-wide OD coordinator can profitably put in full time on a serious program in a district of that size. The working relationship between the superintendent and the coordinator or specialist should be close.

Programs will be more successful if the internal coordinator or specialist has had formal OD training and experience. Lacking that, in-service work for him or her, plus active collaboration with outside consultants, is very desirable.

OD programs should always provide for the training of internal trainers and consultants — the "multiplier effect" — who can deliver various components of the program to new parts of the system. In the districts we studied, the optimal size of such cadres varied from about 10 to 50 people.[9] Where there were fewer or more than this, impact, attitudes and institutionalization tended to be weaker.

10. Program development. The OD program as a whole may move more effectively if it is not only sysematically developed, but has "packages" or subcomponents that can be used repeatedly with new parts of the system, such as building faculties, high school departments, etc. These packages need to be adapted from generally-available OD approaches (see list of materials, Appendix C, of Vol. III), or those from other school districts, to fit local conditions. They will need to be re-adapted as they are used with any particular subsystem within the district. Effective OD programs seem to be incrementally developed as the district selects and adapts subcomponents compatible with its needs and conditions. At least five years of development and use is necessary for the program to become established as a way of life in the district.[9]

---

[9] In addition to support from the three case studies, our district analysis also confirms that something like five years is needed. Specifically, only 42% (of the 45 cases) which began since 1973 have become institutionalized, compared to 73% (of the 30 cases) which began between 1965 and 1972. Five years or more is needed before a program is likely to become established in a district.

11. Negative effects of the OD program are to be expected, including generalized resistance and defensiveness, time overload, threat to vested interests, and job insecurity. They do not seem to jeopardize program success, and are not more frequent in high-impact programs. We infer that they should be looked at carefully during strategic planning, but they are not necessarily indicators for program termination.

Intermediate units. Not all states or provinces have intermediate units aimed at helping provide service to local districts. For those who do, we suggest the following:

1. Infrastructure development. OD will be more likely to flourish in a region when there are adequate, well-trained consulting resources, based both inside and outside local districts. Intermediate units might well take leadership in not only directly supplying outside consultants for districts, but in (a) developing and carrying out OD consultant training programs; and (b) enabling continuing professional development of OD consultants through networks, associations, etc.

2. OD adoption support.[10] Intermediate units might also feasibly consider adapting the approaches used in the National Diffusion Network (see Case Study C, Vol. IV for an explanation) to aid the adoption and implementation of validated OD programs. Specifically, they might fill the "state facilitator" role, working as an information service, and broker of experienced OD consultants, who would aid the local district in adopting/adapting validated OD programs. (For suggestions on validation, see section below on Federal agency involvement.)

3. Fiscal support. Though as we have seen, OD's dollar costs are not large, intermediate units might be helpful, particularly in smaller districts, by supplying matching funds for program initiation, perhaps tapering off after the second year. The scale is probably not more than $5,000 per district.

Secondly, intermediate units might usefully support districts which have carried out successful programs in their dissemination efforts, including presentations at awareness/interest conferences (see below), the production of articles, partial support of district personnel to serve as consultants to other districts, and the development of training manuals and other materials useable by other districts. Lateral dissemination of this sort is likely to be quite critical for acceleration in OD diffusion rates.

---

[10] We use the "adoption" label for convenience, even though with the current state of the art there are few if any "off-the-shelf" OD programs available for schools, and the dominant activity during early implementation is planning. If a National Diffusion Network (NDN)-like approach were taken, however, packaged programs would become more frequent.

4. Awareness/interest development. Much OD work in schools is largely invisible to other districts. Most superintendents have only a vague, fuzzy idea of what OD involves, if they have heard of it at all. Yet their awareness and interest is critical to local adoption. Intermediate units could usefully sponsor one or two-day conferences for school administrators in their regions, in which OD-using district personnel and outside consultants could describe and demonstrate programs with sufficient clarity to lay a platform for subsequent exploration, "adoption", and program planning. Care should be taken that the nature of programs and their potential uses address the basic definitional and operational factors identified in our study.

Universities. Since up to a quarter of school OD consultants we located were university-based, there are some grounds for believing that interest in advancing OD in schools exists. We suggest:

1. The development of programs for the training of OD consultants. The experience of a few universities (ex: Buffalo, Oregon, Pepperdine, George Williams) suggests that there is already a modest market in training for educational OD. Students may be heading for free-lance consulting work, or more typically are administrators aiming for job mobility through advanced degrees.

2. Awareness/interest conferences. Either alone or in collaboration with intermediate units, it would be in a university department's interest to stimulate awareness of OD (and available consulting resources) in its immediate area.

3. Experimental projects. Given the going reward system, university personnel interested in OD often have an above-average interest in OD experimentation, and in research and publication. Much early OD work in schools was university-initiated, and a good deal continues to be. Experimental projects with schools benefit the districts involved, who often receive consulting help at less or no cost, and not only benefit the professors (and graduate student interns) involved, but if well researched lead to advances in the state of the art.

State and Provincial departments of education. It is difficult to make "standard" recommendations for U.S. state departments, since they vary quite substantially in many respects. For example, in the United States, only about a quarter have systematically-set up intermediate units in place, and there is little movement toward such units in other states. One estimate is that perhaps only a third of the states conceive their mission as that of being essentially supportive and facilitative of district improvement (as contrasted with the historic regulatory and funding mission). A recent study showed that the tenure of the chief state school officer averages less than 2 years, which bodes ill for sustained attention to OD programs in local districts.[11]

---

[11] Both the estimate that one-third of the states see their role as supportive and the study of chief state officers come from Richard Herlig, formerly of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

For those states actually committed to assisting local districts, we have the following suggestions:[12]

1. Maintain permissive stance toward OD. The lesson of our mandated "accountability" programs in this study is that requiring system improvement does not work well, perhaps because of the mandated aspect, perhaps because local adaptation and flexibility is limited. OD should not become a state-level demand.

2. Propose enabling legislation. States vary widely in what is required and permitted as far as in-service training and certification are concerned. State departments interested in OD as a way of aiding their mission might draft legislation which would adapt existing in-service regulations (if they exist) to the case of school districts (rather than as at present) to individual practitioners. Such legislation might earmark a fraction of all state funds headed for local schools for OD, to be used by districts who file an appropriate proposal. (The elements of such a proposal might be derived in part from the policy advice we have given to districts above.)

3. Experimental projects. Even in the absence of legislation, state departments might mount a small-grants program aimed at supporting districts who would like to carry out prototype OD projects, with the provision that they be carefully documented and be available for demonstration purposes.

4. Within-department OD. Many state departments, even those with a school-assisting mission, are heavily bureaucratized systems strongly devoted to status quo maintenance; those with innovation-encouraging hopes have often experienced much frustration. We suggest that interested chief state school officers explore the possibility of launching OD programs within their own departments (there are a few precedents for this), both to increase the organization's responsiveness, and to acquaint more SDE personnel directly with what OD feels like when it is well carried out.[13]

---

[12] We concur with the comments by Berman and McLaughlin (1978:44) in their summary of the Rand "Change Agent" project:

> ...the ability of the state to nurture local district development will be a key to long-term prospects for educational improvement. Despite the strides that states have made over the past decade, few SEAs are now capable of handling such a demanding role...Despite significant weaknesses among SEAs, they, rather than federal agencies, have the potential to supply support and assistance to the change process, implementation, and capacity building in local districts.

[13] Here we address some advice to the Office of Education: it might well consider including as part of its state capacity-building grants funds earmarked for (a) OD with state departments as clients; (b) training of state department personnel in OD skills.

We cannot make similar recommendations for Provincial Departments of Education in Canada.[14] The weak infrastructure of OD resources (e.g. personnel internal and external to districts who can carry out and train others in OD) makes any major effort to promote OD ill advised. Partial or superficial use of OD may do more harm than good. On the other hand, there appears to be a large number of individual practitioners in some provinces interested in and using partial forms of OD. Four recommendations or commentaries can be made.

1. Perhaps the best approach is to support with small scale grants or contracts the gradual development of fuller versions of OD for those districts already interested in or using some aspects of OD approaches.

2. The conditions for developing OD in the late 1970's are much different than they were in the late 1960's. We are quite convinced that any expansion of OD efforts will have to be based on linking educational goals and issues with human resource and organizational process development. Therefore, Provincial support for small scale development should be directed at programs which include and link these components.

3. Some inventory or assessment should be made of the existence of OD practitioners skilled in working with school systems (in school districts and without) to determine the nature of the resource base. Strengthening (again, on a small scale) in-service training in OD, and some university-based programs would be worthwhile. Since these kinds of programs now exist on a limited scale the inventory should examine the current relationship between this type of training and whether or not it results in "authentic" OD use in school districts. This information can be used to consider strategies for improving this relationship.

4. Partially related to 3, but also referring to much larger issues is the use of consultants external to Canada (i.e., American). Like so many educational innovations, OD has diffused from the U.S. to Canada. There has been a reliance on American consultants, in the absence of Canadian trained personnel. For example, University Associates has now established a Canadian branch which is offering OD oriented workshops across Canada. This raises at least two major issues. One concerns the question of whether the training received in these workshops will be transferred to use in school districts (for those trainees interested in schools). Stated another way, under what conditions will such a transfer occur, in particular, what is the support base regarding the follow through development of programs in school systems (e.g. in terms of the various goal and operational conditions identified in our study). The second, much larger issue refers to the question of whether OD can or should be transferred from one culture to another. We cannot resolve this question in this study, other than to say that it is worth considering whether the assumptions and practices of OD and the particular forms they take, are appropriate for cultures - and their associated educational systems - outside the country in which they were developed (see Fullan, 1976) for a preliminary discussion regarding Canada and Europe). The basic principles

---

[14] It should be noted that education in Canada is a Provincial matter. There is virtually no direct role of the Federal government in elementary and secondary education in the ten provinces. Each Province operates as a fully autonomous agency concerning education in school districts within its jurisdiction.

and concepts of OD seem applicable to organizational life in Canada, but the particular techniques and approaches may have to be altered. A more indigenous development of Canadian OD practitioners and resources is needed which is based on the conditions and culture of Canada and its regions rather than on a literal transfer or adaptation of American technology.

Federal education agencies. This study was commissioned by NIE, so our primary recommendations go to it. However, we shall suggest a few possibilities for the Office of Education when it comes to proposals that involve service delivery rather than research and development.[15]

1. Devote funds to OD research and development. The primary question is not whether OD is worthwhile in general (it seems to be, for local schools), but whether NIE should do anything in this domain. Given what looks like an only partially formulated and understood educational innovation — but one which seems to "work" at the task of increasing local organizational capability in school districts, even in its present stage of development and understanding — it seems quite likely that a modest level of NIE support for activities like those we advise below could result in a qualitative change in OD programs' adequacy and diffusion. Without NIE support for research, development and diffusion, OD in schools will probably continue ambling along, spreading quite slowly, with little cumulation of knowledge of practice. With such support, our sense is that the current state of the art could be advanced more than incrementally.[16] Below we outline a number of activities, then suggest some priorities among them.

---

[15] Mutatis mutandum, these recommendations might be addressed to Canadian agencies such as the Canada Council, the Departments of Education, or a provincially-supported research and development agency such as the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. We do not try to make the transformations that might be required for maximum usefulness to such agencies.

[16] We should note that this general recommendation is very much congruent with the recommendations for Federal policy made by Berman and McLaughlin (1978) at the conclusion of their study of federal programs supporting educational change. They suggest (p. 40):

> Federal officials...might consider an approach which assumes that school districts are ultimately responsible for improving their own performance, but require both short- and long-run aid to achieve this end. School districts need institutional assistance, but an institutional development strategy can work only if federal officials identify those aspects of the local change process and local organizational characteristics where federal resources and influence can be effective.

Rejecting a technocractic, R&D view of educational change, Berman and McLaughlin go on to suggest improved attention to "all stages of the local change process", to "adaptive implementation assistance" (which is system-focussed, continuous, practitioner-based and process-oriented), and to enhancement of the capacity of school districts to manage change. Though the authors do not use the OD label, they are clearly alluding to processes and outcomes which are characteristic of OD in schools as we have come to know it in our study.

2. Materials review. NIE should let a contract for a careful review of existing OD support materials, including training manuals, and the fashion in which they have been used in school OD programs.[17] Such an inquiry could uncover presently unknown and undiffused materials developed in local districts — like the survey feedback program developed in Winnipeg, and the MBO-OD Programs in Adams County (Vol. IV). The products would be (a) a compendium of existing materials, with critique and suggestions for use; (b) proposals for needed improved materials.

3. Materials development. Another contract, perhaps following the one above, should aim at the development/adaptation of materials that would (a) take a strong structural approach; (b) deal with educational (not just general organizational) issues; (c) be especially supportive of careful early planning of OD programs; (d) since many districts seem to take an adaptive approach to constructing their own particular version, materials should be designed for adaptation and for using in combination with other materials.

4. Prototype practitioner training. NIE should contract for the design, execution, documentation and evaluation of several alternative programs to train OD consultants. Though the primary target should be "insiders" employed by local districts, enough outsiders should be involved so that the skills of linking to and using them productively can be learned.

Such prototypes should use experienced OD insiders as staff members, include visits to existing OD programs, and have much direct experience in real OD programs, (as with the very effective PSOD and consulting skills programs which NTL Institute has carried out for years).

The prototype programs need not be designed de novo; there would be much advantage in an RFP (Request for Proposals) aimed at organizations with strong past capability in general OD practitioner training, including NTL Institute, Unviersity Associates, CEPM at the University of Oregon, Northwest Regional Educational Lab,[18] and the business schools at UCLA, MIT, Case Western Reserve, New Hampshire, Columbia and Stanford.[19]

---

[17] Here, and in many of our subsequent recommendations, economy of effort suggests that our population of 76 districts could be reutilized for studies. In some cases our data could be re-analyzed; in others, telephone interviewing could quickly and easily be carried out.

[18] We were surprised to note that the PETC materials developed at NWREL, and the PETC training program, did not surface in our questionnaire responses. This may be because the OD section of the PETC package is the most recently developed and least diffused. In any case, a careful follow-up analysis of PETC graduates might well be carried out as a sub-task of the materials review contract.

[19] These university programs are perhaps most experienced: we should note also that OD practitioner training programs exist at Bowling Green, SUNY at Buffalo, Brigham Young, Cen[illegible]shington, Concordia (Montreal), George Washington, George Williams, [illegible] (both business school and school of education), Kent State, New York Univer[illegible]ty, Ohio State (education), Pepperdine, Syracuse (education), Chicago (education), Cincinnati, Missouri and West Florida. This information comes from the International Registry of Organizational Development Professionals, produced by the Organization Development Institute.

The documented procedures and materials from such prototype programs could easily be diffused to other trainers, who will be inclined to use them regardless of longer-term evaluation data bearing on the training program's success.[22] At present, formal OD training is largely monopolized by NTL Institute, University Associates, and a handful of universities. These groups would be interested in exploiting the educational OD market (NTL has continued to hold programs for educational consultants since the mid-60's), and there seems no reason not to encourage continued competition for clientele.

5. Practitioner networking. As we have noted, external colleagueship for OD insiders is now rare. The history of OD in non-educational fields shows that colleague support is quite essential for continued development of skill, energy mobilization, well-being, etc. The national OD Network (N about 1300) has held twice-yearly conferences for the past six years; the New York OD Network (N about 150) meets monthly; the Organization Development Institute (N about 300) meets twice yearly. All three have newsletters.[23]

It would be comparatively easy to encourage practitioner networking on an experimental basis, perhaps as an adjunct to NIE's existing interest in networks as a support for educational change. Here too, attention should be focussed on those already interested in OD practitioner networking, specifically CEPM at Oregon, and the EDC group in New York (which is already scheduling a conference on this topic in October of 1978). NIE should not subsidize such networks directly; the lesson of other such networks is that they are supported and managed by practitioners — but it could profitably support documentation of networking efforts. Most studies of educational-change networking are retrospective rather than current, and documenting networking efforts from the beginning would be useful. The networking arrangement should be designed to support the kinds of exchanges (re good materials, OD programs and personnel contact) recommended in this section. Networks which diffuse superficial or low quality ideas and materials would be of limited value (see also Miles, 1977).

It also seems profitable to consider stimulating school-OD subnetworking within existing OD practitioner networks, though NIE's role there might appropriately be limited to supporting dissemination of the present study to them.

6. Conceptual compendium. Beyond the development of support materials, as noted above, NIE should support analytical work aimed at (a) sharpening and clarifying the conceptual base for OD in schools (as Lundberg, 1978, points out, OD in general cannot be said to have anything like a clear theoretical basis); (b) suggesting needed research; (c) providing a sort of consumer's guide to alternative approaches to OD in schools. The latter product may not be easily within reach, but will become more and more needed as diffusion increases. (Our sample of 76 districts could be used as a starting point.)

---

[22] Such later users could sensibly be invited to the prototype programs as observers.

[23] We should also note the existence of other associations: the O.D. division of the Academy of Management, the O.D. Division of the American Society for Training and Development, the Association for Creative Change, the Society for OD in Education (Ontario), and the Canadian Institute for Training and Development.

7. Review of evaluation studies. NIE should spend modest funds for a contractor to retrieve the evaluation studies carried out by the districts in our sample, to draw general conclusions, and propose improved evaluation methods.

8. Awareness conferences. OD efforts in schools presently have very low visibility. Our study shows that a moderate amount of lateral dissemination occurs naturally across districts, initiated by those doing OD. NIE should support several national meetings, primarily meetings of central school administrators, American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and American Supervisors of Curriculum Development (ASCD); secondarily those of elementary and secondary principals) at which (a) the results of this study could be presented and discussed; and (b) inside change agents and administrators from districts with successful programs could tell their story to peers. Our study indicates that a more precise and differentiated awareness of just what OD involves (including the sorts of desirable start conditions, needed supports, and alternative approaches associated with successful outcomes) would aid in intelligent "adoption" (that is, exploration and planning) decisions by superintendents.

9. Case study production and dissemination. Potential users of OD need to know just how it actually works. NIE should commission, and support dissemination of a series of case studies in school OD, perhaps beginning with other successful districts in our present sample. The present format and data collection methods proved very feasible, but the contractor should be asked to review and revise the format based on potential-user information needs.

10. Evaluation/dissemination support to districts. Our study indicates that external agencies, to promote institutionalization, should not be providing more than half of OD funds; we also noted that evaluation studies were missing in half of our sites, and were less than rigorous in most. A program of small grants to LEA's, primarily earmarked for evaluation and dissemination purposes, might have useful payoff. The support need not exceed $5-$10,000, should be supplied on a matching basis, and probably should go only to districts where OD programs are already in place. If the support could also be utilized by districts for activities such as materials packaging for external use, insider training and networking, it would tie even more directly into local incentives.

11. Clearing house. NIE should support some interested and competent agency, such as a regional laboratory or R & D center, to perform the familiar functions of accumulating, storing, retrieving and disseminating OD-relevant materials, with main (but not exclusive) emphasis on educationally-relevant work. The present scale of work on OD would not require as much subsidy as do other clearing houses in the ERIC system. As much emphasis should be placed on local program materials, evaluations, case studies and practitioner training documentation as on research reports, reviews, and conceptual analyses.

12. Grants competition. An RFP should be developed for focussed studies of OD in schools, typically on a modest scale ($15 to 30,000). The following topics are proposed:

a. Case studies of OD programs and their coping strategies over time.

b. Survey of a national probability sample of superintendents assessing their awareness of interest in and use of OD.

c. Study of OD discontinuance and reasons.

d. Analysis of role demands on inside consultants, and derivation of training implications.

e. Study of insider-outsider collaboration strategies in more-successful programs.

f. Examination of state-mandated accountability schemes, to assess their similarities and differences to OD (as in our revised definition), and their consequences more broadly.

g. Study of OD programs with strong student outcome effects.

h. Empirical analysis of what is meant by "administrator support" for OD programs: critical mechanisms, behavior, decisions, etc.

i. Detailed study of the antecedents of successful institutionalization; depiction of thoroughly-institutionalized OD programs.

13. Experimental diffusion efforts. It was suggested earlier that OD programs might be diffused and implemented in a fashion analogous to that employed by the National Diffusion Network under Office of Education auspices for instructional innovations. This recommendation might thus be directed to the Office of Education, which would (a) need to mount something equivalent to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel to validate particular OD materials, approaches and entry strategies; (b) locate particular "developers" of OD approaches; (c) identify state or regional "facilitators" to bring districts and developers together. It is also possible that OD approaches could simply be diffused through the existing NDN.

In addition, NIE could itself mount such an effort independently of OE, as it did in the case of the R&D Utilization Program, which in fact used JDRP-approved products and many NDN participants. But given the large scale of such an effort, the yet-to-come evaluation results from the R & D project, we do not advise it.

14. Direct grants to school districts for OD programs. At present only the Office of Education could legitimately supply such funds, and there is no explicitly-enabling legislation. In our opinion, the state of the art in school OD needs more advancement before such legislation could be responsibly written (note that it has taken something like six years of effort by OE, NIE, AACTE and other concerned parties to get a workable program for teacher centers in place). If NIE engages in research development and diffusion activities along the lines we have suggested,

it might be possible to decide, say by 1982, whether to make Federal funds widely available for OD in schools, and how to disburse them. But until we have more knowledge, a more coherent body of practice, reusable practitioner training programs, and something approaching a critical mass of users (perhaps 4-5% of districts), such a decision cannot be approached.[24]

Priorities. How should NIE be allocating its limited funds to support research, development and dissemination/diffusion of OD in schools? Any weighting of effort is somewhat arbitrary. But given our understanding of the current state of the art, we suggest that resources might be divided as follows:

30% Materials review and development
20% Prototype training programs
20% Research grants competition
20% Evaluation/dissemination grants; clearing house; awareness conferences
10% Other: networking, conceptual compendium, review of evaluation studies, case studies.

As noted earlier, we do not advise that NIE mount experimental diffusion projects on the NDN model, and it cannot provide funds for service delivery.

The assumption behind the ordering above is that more coherent support materials and increasingly professionalized practitioners are needed, along with some attention to dissemination, more than as a comprehensive research program. Put another way, good research on OD in schools needs a larger practice base than is now available.

---

[24] This timetable is careful. Note that teacher center legislation was written when there were less than 100 active teacher centers in the U.S. But (a) there were perhaps 500 in the U.K., and a good deal of practical experience had accumulated; (b) there was recurrent interest in the Office of Education and NIE; and (c) a moderately organized teacher-center constituency.

References

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M.W., Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1978. R-1589/8HEW.

Carlson, R.E., "Barriers to change in public schools" in R. Carlson et al Change processes in the public schools, Eugene, Oregon: CASEA, 1965, pp. 3-8.

Fullan, M., "OD in schools: an overview and critique" in Organizational Development Management in Education Course, (E321), Unit 6, Milton Keynes, U.K., The Open University Press, 1976, pp. 43-51.

Lundberg, C., "The current state of theory in organization development", Oregon State University. Paper read at Academy of Management meetings, San Francisco, August 1978.

Miles, M.N., "On networking". Paper prepared for NIE, 1977.

Pincus, J., Incentives for educational innovation. Review of Educational Research, 44(1); 113-144, 1974.

Schmuck, R.A., and Miles, M.B., Organization development in schools, La Jolla: University Associates, 1971.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends and Arends, J., The second handbook of organization development in schools, Palo Alto: Mayfield Press, 1977.